



## REPLY TO THE OFFICE ACTION

This is reply to the Office action date mailed: 05/30/2006.

1. Claims 1-3 cannot be rejected under 35USC 102(b) as being anticipated by “1705 Queen Anne Crown” because:

a) “1705 Queen Anne Crown” discloses a simple copy of the crown only without any make a change in ; to modify; to vary in any same degree; to change any some of the elements or details, with destroying the identity of the thing affected or with substituting an entirely new thing by the word “copy” means identity only, which not subject matters of alteration of the present invention. To change partially in one or more respects, but without destruction of existence or identity of the thing changed; to increase or diminish.

b) Alteration. Variation; changing; making different. A change of a thing from one

c) form to another; making a thing different from what it was without destroying its identity, to carry out of the arts composition or usage purposes; for beneficial from the denomination elements or details.

d) 1705 absolutely not contains any elements are fund in exactly same situation and

e) are united in same way operating in the same fashion to perform an substantial identical function in a single prior art reference.

2. The Specification, Drawings and claims filed May 5, 2006 are re-file as a part of an amendment to overcame of the Examiner’s objections and rejections in order to been entered.

3. The present Amendment filed to overcome of the Examiner’s objections and

4. rejections to shown of the Possession of the invention by depiction of the

invention in words written description of the structural functions, which permit clearly recognize possession of the invention; instead originally clear depiction of the invention in words written description to represent visual as pictures.

5. The present Amendments not contained any new added matters.
6. The present Amendment contains a substituted Specification which is an adequate
7. written description of the structural functions of the invention, which originally depiction was represented in pictures
8. The present Amendment contains a substitute set of detailed drawings that shown by a clear depiction of the possession of the invention, which originally depiction of the invention was represented as pictures.
9. The present Amendment contains a substitute set of claims to represent of the
10. original field claims rephrased in light of the substituted of the depiction of the original filed invention. No new matters added.
11. A description as filed must be presumed to be adequate, unless or until sufficient evidence or reasoning to the contrary, burden on the Examiner, has been presented by the Examiner to rebut the presumption. Including the inquiry into whether, the description requirement is met at respect to “is not written in proper idiomatic English and is replete with grammatical errors too mention specifically” as is a question in fact; and “Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 USC 112 , as being indefinite for failing rejection to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards the invention. The claims appear to be merely a list of definitions of words. They do not define an invention “as is a question in fact.

12. The present Office action is a repeated of the previous Office action with some general allegation and advice to appeal only; without fully respond to applicant's rebuttal arguments, and properly treat any further showings submitted by applicant in the replay; without review the basis for the rejection, in view of the record as a whole, including amendments, arguments and any evidence submitted by applicant, instead written description requirement, must be thoroughly analyzed and discussed in the next Office action.

Brooklyn, New York


Respectfully submitted,



Gersh Korsinsky,



Eduard Korsinsky,



Michael Korsinsky